

REMARKS

Specification:

The disclosure was objected to because the formula shown in the remark filed 7/12/05 is not sufficient to overcome the objection. The Examiner stated an amendment in the specification is required. The specification has been amended accordingly.

Claim Objections:

Claim 5 and 23 were objected to because the limitation "determining a value step number of the metric values" is not clear. These claims have been cancelled with this response.

Rejections under 35 USC §112, first paragraph:

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 USC §112 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This claim has been canceled.

Rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph:

Claims 22 and 25 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. In particular claim 22 had insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the processed metric values" and claim 25 should be changed to read --means for determining an index of the metric values--. Claim 22 has been amended accordingly and claim 25 has been cancelled.


Allowable Subject Matter:

Claim 2 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, claim 1 was amended to include those limitations originally found in claim 2.

Regarding claims 19 and 28: On page 8 of the Examiner's office action, the Examiner states that "Classon and Xu do not teach computing at least one metric value for a current recursion of the current window in the current iteration based on the metric values of another window that were recursively computed in a previous iteration." Claims 19 and 28 were amended to include this limitation. Therefore, claims 19 and 28 are in proper condition for allowance.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. As the Applicant has overcome all substantive rejections given by the Examiner the Applicant contends that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's rejections to the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter. Finally, please charge any fees (including extension of time fees) or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502117.

Respectfully Submitted,
Blankenship, ET AL.

by: 
Kenneth A. Haas
Reg. No. 42,614
Phone: (847) 576-6937

Please send correspondence to:

MOTOROLA, INC.
1303 E. Algonquin Rd.
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer No. 22917